REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June

14, 2007.   The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application.

Upon entry of this response, claims 8, 9, and 12-32 are pending in the present application.

Claims 12 and 24 are objected to because of various informalities.   Claims 12, 14, 18, 20,

24-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Frailong*

et al. (U.S. 6,496,858, hereinafter *"Frailong"*).   Furthermore, claims 8 and 9 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Frailong* in view of *Wilson* (U.S. Pat. No.

6,718,347).   Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims

are respectfully requested.

I.   Response to Claim Objections

On page 3, the Office Action states that with respect to claims 12 and 24, Applicants

should amend the claims in order to increase readability of the pending claims.   As indicated

above, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 24 to now include line indentations and submit

that no new matter is added by the amendments.   Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

that the claim objections be withdrawn.

II.   Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of

each element of the claim under consideration."   *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,

721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).   Therefore, every claimed feature

of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 12, 14, 18, 20, 24-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Frailong*.   For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants traverse these rejections.

Independent Claim 12 is Patentable Over Frailong

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the features emphasized below in claim 12.

Claim 12, as amended, recites (emphasis added):

> 12. A method of synchronizing configuration parameters on a server with a database of stored configuration parameters comprising:
>   automatically updating at least one **application program configuration parameter** in response to updating at least one corresponding stored application configuration parameter in said database **by a particular customer of a web hosting provider**,
>   wherein each application program configuration parameter defines at least in part a set of resources on the server available to the particular customer of a web hosting provider.

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Frailong* reference fails to teach of application program configuration parameters.   In alleging that *Frailong* teaches this feature on page 3, the Office Action refers to the following text passages in *Frailong* (emphasis added):

> This second means of access allows a secondary service provider to remotely configure, upgrade, and maintain diagnostics related to the network interface. It also facilitates <u>the downloading of configuration parameters</u>, a task which was traditionally left to the client LAN manager.

(Col. 5, lines 16-19).

> The reconfiguration information is contained within a reconfiguration notification message which notifies the gateway interface device of the availability of <u>reconfiguration parameters</u>. The reconfiguration notification basically comprises operations <u>instructing the addition or deletion of parameter entries within the data store</u>.

(Col. 17, lines 54-59).

While *Frailong* teaches of downloading configuration parameters and of operations instructing the addition or deletion of parameter entries within the data store, the configuration

9

parameters taught by *Frailong* are not equivalent to the application program configuration

parameter recited in claim 12.   Claims 12 clearly recites "*application program* configuration

parameter" and not merely "configuration parameter.   In rejecting claim 12, the Office Action

also cites the following text passage from *Frailong*:

> In this manner, remote management server 206 basically serves as a repository <u>for information required by the gateway interface device 208</u>. Such information may include <u>configuration information related to LAN 210</u>, internet address blocks, internet domain names, and data related to the physical and logical interfaces between the client network 220 and ISP 204.

(Col. 5, lines 37-40).   The Office Action apparently equates the "information required by the

gateway interface" (*e.g.,* configuration information, internet address blocks, internet domain

names, and data related to physical/logical interfaces) taught by *Frailong* to the "application

program configuration parameter" recited in claim 12 above.   Applicants respectfully disagree

and submit that the "information" referenced in the text passage above is not equivalent to the

application program configuration parameter recited in claim 12.

Notwithstanding, Applicants have amended claim 12 in an effort to advance prosecution.

Claim 12 now recites: "automatically updating at least one application program configuration

parameter in response ***to updating*** at least one corresponding stored application configuration

parameter in said database ***by a particular customer of a web hosting provider***."

Applicants respectfully submit that *Frailong* fails to teach this feature.   While *Frailong* teaches

that "[e]ach service manager allows a user, through a user interface, to perform certain service

functions, such as bring down the service, reconfigure the service, and bring the service back

up," *Frailong* fails to teach of automatically updating at least one application program

configuration parameter in response to a particular customer of a web hosting provider updating

at least one corresponding stored application configuration parameter in the database.

Frailong, in fact, teaches that "[t]he implementation of a console-less operating system runtime

allows the system software to operate *<u>without user intervention</u>*" and that the "system also

10

provides an interface <u>to existing network services</u> which are wrapped in a management layer to allow them to be plugged in or interfaced to the system *without requiring user intervention or configuration.*"   (Col. 7, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the highlighted features in claim 12 above.

Independent Claim 18 is Patentable Over Frailong

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the features emphasized below in claim 18.

Claim 18 recites (emphasis added):

> 18. An information processing system comprising:
> at least one network server running at least one application program, ***wherein application program operation is defined at least in part by a set of configuration parameters stored on said at least one network server and associated with said application program operation***;
> a database separate from said at least one network server and storing a copy of said set of configuration parameters; and
> means for automatically maintaining synchronization between said set of configuration parameters stored on said at least one network server and said copy of said set of configuration parameters stored in said database, wherein the server is operated by a web-hosting provider and wherein each application program configuration parameter defines at least in part a set of resources on the network server available to a particular customer of the web hosting provider.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Frailong* fails to teach the features emphasized above in clam 18.   Claim 18 recites, "wherein application program operation is defined at least in part by a set of configuration parameters . . . associated with said application program operation." In alleging that *Frailong* teaches this feature on page 4, the Office Action refers to Col. 4, lines 58-65.   The cited text states that the gateway interface device contains <u>application program interfaces (API's)</u> for transparent communication between the client LAN and various internet

11

services.   Applicants will first assume, *arguendo*, that the presence of an API implies the

presence of an associated application program.   Even then, nowhere does *Frailong* teach that

<u>operation of either API's or application programs are defined at least in part by a set of</u>

<u>configuration parameters</u>.   Rather, the "configuration parameters" taught by *Frailong* refer to

configuration information related to LAN 210, internet address blocks, internet domain names,

and data related to the physical and logical interfaces between the client network 220 and ISP

204.   (*See* Col. 5, lines 30-36.)   *Frailong* does not disclose, teach, or suggest any relationship

between this configuration information and the APIs or their associated programs.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18 patently defines

over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the

highlighted features in claim 18 above.

Independent Claim 24 is Patentable Over Frailong

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 patently defines over *Frailong*

for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the features emphasized

below in claim 24.

Claim 24, as amdned, recites (emphasis added):

> 24. A method of synchronizing configuration parameters on a
> server with a database of stored configuration parameters comprising:
> ***automatically updating at least one application program***
> ***configuration parameter in response to updating at least one***
> ***corresponding stored application configuration parameter in said***
> ***database by a particular user of a web hosting provider***,
> wherein each application program configuration parameter defines
> at least in part a set of resources on the server available to the particular
> user of the server.

In alleging that *Frailong* teaches of application program configuration parameters, the

Office Action again cites Col. 4, lines 16-19 from the *Frailong* reference.   However, as

discussed above, the "configuration parameters" that the Office Action refers to are not

equivalent to application program configuration parameters.

Notwithstanding, Applicants have amended claim 24 in an effort to advance prosecution. Claim 24 now recites: "automatically updating at least one application program configuration parameter in response to _**updating**_ at least one corresponding stored application configuration parameter in said database _**by a particular user of a web hosting provider**_." Applicants respectfully submit that *Frailong* fails to teach this feature. While *Frailong* teaches that "[e]ach service manager allows a user, through a user interface, to perform certain service functions, such as bring down the service, reconfigure the service, and bring the service back up," *Frailong* fails to teach of automatically updating at least one application program configuration parameter in response to a particular customer of a web hosting provider updating at least one corresponding stored application configuration parameter in the database. *Frailong*, in fact, teaches that "[t]he implementation of a console-less operating system runtime allows the system software to operate _without user intervention_" and that the "system also provides an interface to existing network services which are wrapped in a management layer to allow them to be plugged in or interfaced to the system _without requiring user intervention or configuration_." (Col. 7, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the highlighted features in claim 24 above.

**Independent Claim 26 is Patentable Over Frailong**

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 26 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the features emphasized below in claim 26.

Claim 26 recites (emphasis added):

13

26. An information processing system comprising:
at least one network server running at least one application program, ***wherein application program operation is defined at least in part by a set of configuration parameters stored on said at least one network server and associated with said application program operation***;
a database separate from said at least one network server and storing a copy of said set of configuration parameters; and
means for automatically maintaining synchronization between said set of configuration parameters stored on said at least one network server and said copy of said set of configuration parameters stored in said database, wherein each application program configuration parameter defines at least in part a set of resources on the network server that are made available to a particular user of the network server.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Frailong* fails to teach the features emphasized above in clam 26.   Claim 26 recites, "wherein application program operation is defined at least in part by a set of configuration parameters . . . associated with said application program operation." In alleging that *Frailong* teaches this feature on page 5, the Office Action refers to Col. 4, lines 58-65.   The cited text states that the gateway interface device contains <u>application program interfaces (API's)</u> for transparent communication between the client LAN and various internet services.   However, nowhere does *Frailong* teach that <u>operation of these API's are defined at least in part by a set of configuration parameters</u>.   While *Frailong* teaches of "configuration parameters," these parameters appear to refer to configuration information related to LAN 210, internet address blocks, internet domain names, and data related to the physical and logical interfaces between the client network 220 and ISP 204.   (*See* Col. 5, lines 30-36.)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 26 patently defines over *Frailong* for at least the reason that *Frailong* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the highlighted features in claim 26 above.

Dependent Claims 8-9, 13-17, 19-23, 25, and 27-32 are Patentable

Applicants submit that dependent claims 8-9, 13-17, 19-23, 25, and 27-32 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable independent claim.   *See, e.g., In re Fine*, 837 F. 2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah
Registration No. 48,472

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500